

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,384	07/14/2003	M. Scott Corson	060556	5434
23696 OUALCOMM	7590 06/23/200 INCORPORATED	EXAMINER		
5775 MOREH	OUSE DR.	RUTKOWSKI, JEFFREY M		
SAN DIEGO,	CA 92121		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2416	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com kascanla@qualcomm.com nanm@qualcomm.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

T	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,384	CORSON ET AL.	
ſ	Examiner	Art Unit	
ı	JEFFREY M. RUTKOWSKI	2416	

	JEFFREY M. RUTKOWSKI	2416						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 18 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
<ol> <li>\( \)\[ \]\[ \]\[ \]\[ \]\[ \]\[ \]\[ \]\[</li></ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I.	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extel Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	,	(-,						
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, i</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further control (b)</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec		ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).					
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: 1-5.7-14.18-21.25.30.33.35.39.42 and	<u>44-53</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach-	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).  13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
/KWANG B. YAO/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416								

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments with respect to the generation of a list of network nodes in the end node and all the claimed limitations being performed by the end node are not persuasive. The claims do not require the list to be generated by the end node. The claims only require the list be generated, but do not require a particular node generate the list. The only limitation that is required to be performed by the end node is the fault response operation. Khalli's HA generates the list of network nodes and distributes the list of network nodes and distributes the list of network nodes not end node, see co.l. 5 lines 42-47. The Examiner agrees with the Applicant as far as was was taught by Khalil and would agree that if the claim required the list of network nodes be generated by the end node, the claimed invention would be different from Khalil.

The arguments with respect to Lehtovirta not disclosing the determination of a fault response from information stored at the end node are not presusaive. From a reading of Lehtovirta, the failing node notifies the UEs of a failure. The UEs then determine a fault response operation (release some or all RABs while maintaining other RABs) based on the failure message that is stored in an end nodes memory, see paragraphs 0044-0045. The claims do not require the end node to determine the type of fault. The claims only require the end nodes to determine the fault response oceration to be performed.